UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

CHRISTO LASSITER,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:10-cv-10

VS.

Spiegel, J. Litkovitz, M.J.

DEVON L. DULLAGHAN, et al.,

Defendant.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION¹

This civil action is before the Court on defendants The City of Cincinnati, Unnamed Officials in the City of Cincinnati Prosecutor's Office, and Unnamed Police Officers' motion to dismiss plaintiff's complaint for lack of jurisdiction and failure to state any claim upon which relief can be granted (Doc. 18), and the parties' responsive memoranda. (Docs. 22, 25).

On November 17, 2010, the Court granted plaintiff's motion for leave to file a third amended complaint, and plaintiff's third amended complaint was filed that same day. (Docs. 47 48). Plaintiff's third amended complaint adds the names of previously unnamed City of Cincinnati Officials and Police Officers. Since an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint and is the "legally operative complaint," *Parry v. Mohawk Motors of Mich., Inc.,* 236 F.3d 299, 306 (6th Cir. 2000), *cert. denied*, 533 U.S. 951 (2001), defendants' motion to dismiss the original complaint should be denied as moot. *See ComputerEase Software, Inc. v. Hemisphere Corp.*, Case No. 1:06-cv-247, 2007 WL 852103, *1 (S.D. Ohio March 19, 2007).

¹ Attached hereto is a NOTICE to the parties regarding objections to this Report and Recommendation.

Accordingly, it is hereby **RECOMMENDED** that defendants' motion to dismiss (Doc.

18) should be **DENIED** as moot.²

Date: 12/22/2010

Haven L. Lithout

United States Magistrate Judge

² On December 17, 2010, defendants The City of Cincinnati, City of Cincinnati Prosecutor Karla Burtch, City of Cincinnati Police Officers Wheeler, Neville-Lipps, and Murphy filed a motion to dismiss the third amended complaint in its entirety against the City of Cincinnati defendants. (Doc. 50). Defendants' subsequent motion to dismiss renews the arguments made in its initial motion to dismiss and raises new grounds for dismissal surrounding the newly named City defendants in plaintiff's third amended complaint.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

CHRISTO LASSITER,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:10-cv-10

VS.

Spiegel, J. Litkovitz, M.J.

DEVON L. DULLAGHAN, et al.,

Defendant.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), any party may serve and file specific, written objections to this Report & Recommendation ("R&R") within **14 DAYS** of the filing date of this R&R. That period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion by either side for an extension of time. All objections shall specify the portion(s) of the R&R objected to, and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. A party shall respond to an opponent's objections within **14 DAYS** after being served with a copy of those objections. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn,* 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters,* 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).

Case: 1:10-cv-00010-SAS-KLL Doc #: 51 Filed: 12/23/10 Page: 4 of 4 PAGEID #: 567			
	SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION	COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY	
	 Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired. Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you. Attach this card to the back of the mailplece, or on the front if space permits. 	A. Signature	Agent □ Addressee
		B. Received by (Printed Name)	C. Date of Delivery
	1. Article Addressed to:	 D. Is delivery address different from iter If YES, enter delivery address below 	
	Univ. Cinti College of Law		3
	PO Box 210040 Clifton Annuar Calhorn Street Cincinnati, Onio 45221-0040	3. Septice Type Certified Mail Registered Return Recu	If eipt for Merchandise
		Li induited trials Li C.C.D.	
A 25 1		4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)	☐ Yes
*	2. Article Number 7002	3150 0000 8389 0804	f
	PS Form 3811, August 2001 Domestic R	etum Receipt	102595-02-M-1540

1:10cv10 (Doc. 51)